arXiv:0805.0752v2 [quant-ph] 7 May 2008

Surprising attractive potential barriers and repulsive wells.

Zakhariev B.N.,
Laboratory of theoretical Physics, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

Abstract
We reveal the fundamental fact that in the old good quantum mechanics there is possible such unexpected inversion: potential barriers can drag in wave-particles and wells can push them off.

Keywords: interaction matrix elements
PACS:

This was hidden till now in the well-known convenient often used multichannel formalism with matrix interactions and matrix wave functions and inaccessible inside "black boxes" of our mighty computers which perform for us cumbersome numerical calculations. It is especially interesting to find new properties which existence could not be supposed as seeming evidently absolute nonsense. Although usually the magic of scientific discoveries consist in more or less striking transition from unknown or "impossible" to something surprisingly simple [1]. Such unexpected additions to our intuition are important for widening our basic notions for further search of surprises of nature. This is an important step to quantum control of complex systems. It opens the way to better understanding many-dimensional and many-body systems.

The multichannel formalism is one of the most powerful tools to describe such objects by reduction to solution of simple ordinary differential coupled Schrödinger equations. It becomes very popular after the famous papers by Feshbach [2]. We ourselves were then stimulated to generalize this practical apparatus to consider reactions with rearrangement of particles published in by Feshbach's Ann. Phys. N.Y. [3] and later have even published a book [4]. After that we have taken a part in development the quantum inverse problem multichannel formalism [5, 6], which gave infinite number of exactly solvable models.

The main step in the close coupled channels approach is the expansion of N-dimensional wave function $\Psi(x_1, ..., x_N)$ in a set of known basic functions $\Phi_\alpha(x_2, ..., x_N)$ which depend on N-1 variables [3, 4]:

$$\Psi(x_1, ..., x_N) = \sum_\alpha \Psi_\alpha(x_1)\Phi_\alpha(x_2, ..., x_N) \tag{1}$$

Here the coefficients $\Psi_\alpha(x_1)$ are α- channel functions (partial channel components). They can be considered as a new vector representation of the initial wave function. Here α is a multi-index with so much components $(N-1)$ as the number of variables in basic functions. This is like a substitution of part of $N-1$ continuous variables $x_{i\geq 2}$ by the lattice of discrete channel variables α. Here will be useful our experience in dealing with this formalism [6].

The expansion coefficients $\Psi_\alpha(x_1)$ dependent on one variable x_1 are found by solving the **system** of **ordinary** differential equations (coupled one-dimensional Schrödinger equations) instead of equations in partial derivatives for $\Psi(x_1, ..., x_N)$:

$$-\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\Psi_\alpha(x) + \sum_\beta V_{\alpha\beta}(x)\Psi_\beta(x) = E_\alpha\Psi_\alpha(x), \;\; E_\alpha = E - \epsilon_\alpha, \tag{2}$$

$$V_{\alpha\beta}(x) = \int d\xi \Phi^*_\alpha(\xi) V(x,\xi)\Phi_\beta(\xi). \tag{3}$$

Here we take $x \equiv x_1$, $\xi \equiv \{x_i\}_{i=2}^N$, and $V(x,\xi)$ is the potential of corresponding multi-dimensional problem. The eigenvalues ϵ_α are related to basic functions Φ_α and are threshold energies above which the corresponding partial channels become open. See more about the channel energies E_α in [5].

The multichannel approach allows to describe the multi-dimensional and multi-particle systems in nuclear, atomic, molecular physics, etc. It allows to consider processes with excitation of their different internal degrees of freedom and also to solve problems with mixing of spin states, see [2, 4, 5].

The difference of the multi-channel equation (3) from *scalar* one-channel case consists in that here we have **vector** wave function $\Psi_\alpha(x)$ and instead of scalar potential $V(x)$ we have interaction **matrix** $V_{\alpha\beta}(x)$. Also instead of scalar spectral weight factors (SWF) c_ν here serve spectral weight vectors (SWV) with components $C_{\alpha m} = \Psi'_\alpha(0, E_m)$ (in Gelfand-Levitan approach and some other one in Marchenko formalism).

It is convenient to analyze the system of one-dimensional equations (3) comparing the rules for channel wave bending for the simplest single-channel case with scalar wave $\Psi(x)$ instead of vector valued one in (3) under the influence of the given scalar potential $V(x)$ instead of matrix valued one:

$$-\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\Psi_(x) = (E - V(x))\Psi_(x) \tag{4}$$

For positive kinetic energy $E - V(x)$ the simple rule of bending $\Psi(x)$ is prescribed by the value of its second derivative $\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\Psi(x)$ proportional to $\Psi(x)$ itself . This rule is to curve the wave **to the x-axis** independent on sign of $\Psi(x)$. It is illustrated by the limit unperturbed case $V(x) = 0$ of free $\sin(\sqrt{E}x)$ wave. For negative $E - V(x)$ the bending take place in opposite direction: **from the x-axis**.

Taking this into account let us get instructive generalized bending rules for the partial waves of multichannel formalism. The diagonal terms $(E_\alpha - V_{\alpha\alpha}(x))\Psi_\alpha(x)$ influence on the intensity $\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\Psi_\alpha(x)$ of bending $\Psi_\alpha(x)$ in analogy with the one-channel case: they yield to bending $\Psi(x)$ **to or from the x axis**. But the more extensive manifold of nondiagonal $V_{\alpha\beta}(x)$ appears to have more diverse behavior. For the same signs of coupled channel wave functions $\Psi_\alpha(x)$, $\Psi_\beta(x)$ the interaction matrix $V_{\alpha\beta}(x)$ acts analogous to usual potential or diagonal matrix elements $V_{\alpha\alpha}(x)$. Their wells or barriers increase or decrease the intensity $\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\Psi_\alpha(x)$ of partial wave bending to x axis. But for the opposite signs of $\Psi_\alpha(x)$, $\Psi_\beta(x)$ there is paradoxically inverted situation: as if there are **"attractive barriers"! and "repulsive wells"!**. This unusual but nevertheless simple formulation of matrix interaction rules appears to be useful for clear understanding some previously mysterious quantum peculiarities. Really for the same

signs of $\Psi_1(x)$ and $\Psi_1(x)$ barriers in $V_{\alpha\alpha}(x)$ and $V_{\alpha\beta}(x)$ in both terms $-V_{\alpha\alpha}(x))\Psi_\alpha(x)$ and $-V_{\alpha\beta}(x)\Psi_\beta(x)$ in the α equation in 3 are subtracted from the energy value E_α and make smaller the bending intensity $|\Psi"_\alpha(x)|$. Analogously act the potential matrix elements in the β -equation in 3. Wells in $V_{\alpha\beta}(x)$ change$|\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\Psi_\alpha(x)|$ and $|\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\Psi_\beta(x)|$ also as diagonal matrix elements $V_{\alpha\alpha}(x)$ and $V_{\beta\beta}(x)$. But for different signs of $\Psi_\alpha(x)$ and $\Psi_\beta(x)$ the *coupling terms in* (3) *have the opposite influence*. It is better seen if we write the right hand side of partial equation in the form of *effective kinetic energy* with common factor $\Psi_\alpha(x)$:

$$E_{kin}\Psi_\alpha(x) \equiv [E_\alpha - V_{\alpha\alpha}(x) - V_{\alpha\beta}(x)\Psi_\beta(x)/\Psi_\alpha(x)]\Psi_\alpha(x)$$

. Here it is evident that the influence of the nondiagonal matrix element $V_{\alpha\beta}(x)$ directly depends on the sign of the fraction $\Psi_\beta(x)/\Psi_\alpha(x)$, namely on relative signs of Ψ_β and $\Psi_\alpha(x)$. So trivial appears the rule for increasing or decreasing the **effective kinetic energy** which straightforwardly corresponds to attraction or repulsion of $V_{\alpha\beta}(x)$. Not only we get the simplest explanation of "impossible" inversion: attraction $longleftrightarrow$ repulsion, but we get the universal rule for **arbitrary** coupling term in **any** interaction matrix.

In conclusion we emphasize that the previously unmentioned peculiarity of nondiagonal elements of the interaction matrices is a very important correction of our quantum notions. This must facilitate the difficult task of understanding behavior of complex systems in future research.

Author is thankful to V.M. Chabanov for valuable collaboration.

References

[1] Zakhariev B.N. Joys of creative life for everybody; Concepts of Physics, Vol. III, p. 335-347, 2006.

[2] Feshbach H. Unified Theory of Nuclear reactions I, Ann.Phys. , N.Y. v. 5 , 357; II, 1958, Ann.Phys., N.Y. v.19, 287, 1962.

[3] Efimenko T.G., Zhigunov V.P., Zakhariev B.N. Rearrangement collisions in unified theory of nuclear reactions, Ann. Phys. N.Y., v.47, 275, 1968.

[4] Zhigunov V.P., Zakhariev B.N. Methods of close coupling of channels in quantum scattering theory, Atomizdat, Moscow, 1974.

[5] Zakhariev B.N., Chabanov V.M., "Submissive Quantum Mechanics: New Status of the Theory in Inverse Problem Approach", Nova Science Publishers, New York, 2007, improved version of Russian book, http://theor.jinr.ru/∼zakharev/: Moscow 2002. See also : Inverse Problems, (topical review),**13**, R47-R79 (1997); Resonance absolute quantum reflection at selected energies, Phys.Rev.Lett. 87, N16, 160408 (2001).

[6] V.M.Chabanov and B.N.Zakhariev, Amirkhanov I.V., Toward the Quantum design of multichannel systems. The inverse problem approach. Ann.Phys. (N.Y.) **285** 1-24, 2000.